

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION	NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/757,963	3	01/10/2001	John S. Flowers	HVWD-01008US0 MEM/SBS	9385	
758	7590	01/23/2004		EXAMINER		
	CK & WE		MOORTHY, ARAVIND K			
	N VALLET LIFORNIA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MOUN	MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041 2131			/′		
				DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004	DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	. •
. Advisory Action	09/757,963	FLOWERS ET AL.	
Advisory Addish	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aravind K Moorthy	2131	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 31 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data of the period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S I 36(a) and the appropriat	See MPEP
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	statutory period for reply originally set in inths after the mailing date of the final reje	the final Office action; or ection, even if timely filed	(2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	etion(s):		
 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 		separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 		to issues which we	ere newly
 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w 			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	EMMANUEL L. MI PRIMARY EXAMI	
		11/4 04 16	





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that Huff discloses only an IDS that is aware of only actual intrusions. The applicant argues that Huff fails to disclose a VDS. The applicant argues that Huff that the agents are not aware of potential attacks but of only actual attacks. The applicant argues that Huff fails to distinguish the vulnerabilities of one host from other hosts while examining traffic. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that the IDS is aware of actual attacks and suspected threats and also it is not claimed that the IDS is aware of only potential attacks. As cited by the examiner in the previous action, Huff does discloses an agent that is capable of gathering information about the network to determine vulnerabilities of the hosts on the network. Huff is able to distinguish threats on each node...